

the State Department and by our government.

□ 1600

It is a card. It is an I.D. card. Foreign governments now have every right to give their nationals any kind of identification that they want to. But what is odd and what has happened in the last several months is that the government of Mexico has charged its consular officials here in the United States with the responsibility of going out and actually lobbying State and local governments to get them to accept this matricula consular card from their nationals who are living here illegally, because, of course, that card has only one purpose. If you are in the United States of America, if you are a national from a foreign country who is here and if you are here legally, you have some documentation to that effect. We have given you a green card. We have given you a passport. Whatever it is, you have documentation from the United States that you are here legally.

If you are here illegally, you need some sort of identification, and that is what this card provides. Recognizing that, and recognizing that they cannot get amnesty through the Congress, they have begun to go to State and local governments all over the United States, lobbying them to get them to accept this card.

They have done it to the banking industry, and the banks have been all too happy to go along with it, looking at their bottom line, looking at profits, even over the security of the Nation, because there is nothing secure about these cards. There is no way to guarantee that the person holding the card is who in fact that card says he is. In fact, we have already arrested people in this country carrying three or four of these identification cards. Their picture is on them, but different names on each card. They are easily fraudulently developed.

So the idea that they have some sort of advantage because they have a secure card is ridiculous. Beyond that, it is again attempting to do exactly the same thing we did not do in the Congress, and that is to give everybody amnesty. Because if you can use this matricula consular card to obtain bank accounts, to get your kids in school, to get housing from the housing authority in their area, get your driver's license, get your library card, everything that a citizen of this country can use their own identification for, if you can do that using this matricula consular card given to you by a foreign government, then of course there is no reason to actually push for amnesty. You will have achieved it. Everyone living in the United States of America illegally, up to 20 million people, will have this card given to them by their government.

By the way, it is now just Mexico and Honduras and I think there are five other countries in South and Central America providing this card now. What is to say that other countries would

not demand exactly the same thing from the United States? Why would the government of Syria not say that they are going to give people living here in the United States illegally this card? How would we tell them that they cannot do that or we will not accept it?

Not only that, we have found the administration, just a little bit ago, we found the regs that have been promulgated by the Department of Treasury now allow the banks to accept these cards. So our own administration, our own government is in league with the governments of these foreign countries who have given these cards to their nationals living illegally in the United States. Our own government is helping these people violate our own laws. That is the truth of the matter. That is an abomination, and that is something we should not allow to go forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REJECT UNFAIR REPUBLICAN TAX CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, now that we have declared victory over Iraq, the country's attention will turn once again to important domestic priorities. Unfortunately, we find our economy in a great slump.

The President and my Republican colleagues come before you with a program that I believe is woefully inadequate, because all they have done is trot out their all-purpose solution to domestic problems: More tax cuts. I would say to my Republican colleagues that was then, this is now.

In the year 2000, we had a surplus, a \$5.6 billion surplus. At that time, then-Governor George Bush said he wanted to give the surplus back to the taxpayers and invigorate the economy. I would suggest that the economy has not been invigorated. Two years later millions have lost their jobs and we are looking at deficits of \$2 trillion going forth over the next 10 years.

So the question Americans should ask is, why do they want to cut taxes now if the rationale for the tax cut in 2001 was that we had a surplus? We do not have a surplus today. We have huge deficits today. We also have a war

against terrorism and a homeland security program to fund.

Reducing government resources at a time of war against Iraq and a war against terrorism just does not make sense. It is kind of like George Bush said when he was running for President, "It is fuzzy math."

In the year 2001, President Bush passed through his tax cut, \$1.3 trillion, saying it would stimulate the economy. Again, 2 years later, economic growth stands at a mere 1 percent, compared to the 4 percent growth from 1996 to 2000 during the Clinton administration.

Additionally, despite President Bush's promise in his 2001 tax cut that he would invigorate the economy, 2.7 million Americans have lost their jobs. The stock market has lost about 40 percent of its value, roughly \$7 trillion.

The tax cut program did not work. Their all-purpose solution just does not cut it. But that did not deter my conservative colleagues. This week on the House floor we will hear more of the same. We have the Bush tax cut, and now we have the tax cut of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Originally the Bush plan would provide a tax cut of \$27,000 for households earning more than \$1 million a year. The top 5 percent would receive 64 percent of all the tax cut breaks. That seems pretty bad. But along comes the Thomas tax bill that we are going to consider this week. It is even more unfair. According to the Brookings Institute analysis, the average tax cut offered under the Thomas proposal for households earning more than \$1 million would be, get this, \$43,000 for people earning more than \$1 million a year. The top 5 percent of American households would get 75 percent of the tax cut.

So when they tell you the tax cut is for everybody, do not buy it. It is clearly a tax cut for the rich. When you give the Republicans these numbers, they say okay, we are giving a tax cut to the rich, but the rich create jobs and the jobs will trickle down. Remember, that was then, this is now. The tax cuts in 2001, \$1.3 trillion, did not invigorate the economy, did not create jobs. People in fact lost jobs. Tax cuts for the wealthy do not stimulate the economy.

Let me talk a little bit about why it is even more unfair. They make the tax cuts for the wealthy permanent. Remember that 75 percent goes to the wealthy. Those are permanent. When it comes to the child care tax credit that could benefit working Americans, what happens? Well, the child care tax credit drops from \$1,000 in 2005 to \$700 in 2006, and after 2006 the child care tax credit is phased out, so working Americans get nothing.

The same thing with small business. My Republican colleagues say, well, we will make the dividend tax cut for the very wealthy permanent, but the small business tax cuts and tax breaks to provide more deductions for small businesses and help them expand and create jobs, they phase out after 5 years.